



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of the three-fold division of powers in a political society, for the society of nations is a political association, and is, if it chooses to be, a body politic. In the Hague Conferences we recognize an international body which recommends, if it does not actually make, laws for the society, because the conventions and declarations drafted by the delegates, and approved by the Conference, are transmitted by the Dutch Minister of Foreign Affairs to the civilized powers forming the society of nations, to be ratified by the appropriate branches of the contracting parties, and to be adhered to by the appropriate branches of the powers which did not attend the Conference, should they be minded to unite themselves with the contracting powers. In the administrative council we recognize the germ of an executive—that is to say, of a body to carry into effect the projects of the Conference which have been ratified by the nations and to supervise their execution and operation. We also recognize in the proposal of a court of arbitration the first step towards an international judiciary, as the organ or agent of the society, just as a judiciary is an organ or agent of every member of the society of nations.

Believing, as I do, that international organization is the question of the day, and that it must confront us until it is solved, that the relations of nations can only be peaceable if they are based upon justice, I am convinced that there must first be some agency of the society to recommend, if not to make, the law which is to govern the conduct of nations; that there must, second, be some agency of the society to call the recommendations of the Conference to the attention of the powers, in order that they may be ratified; to call to their attention the terms of such acts of the Conference as have been ratified in order to prevent their violation, and to exercise such supervision as the society may decide to be compatible with the independence of its members on the one hand and their solidarity on the other, and that there must, third, be a court of the society to ascertain, to interpret, and to apply the law of nations, customary or conventional, to the disputes which necessarily must arise between and among the members of the society, if peace founded upon justice is ever to prevail in a war-ridden world.

In closing, let me quote, and, by quoting, make my own, as far as one can, the words of a great, a wise, and a generous French statesman, uttered in a moment of inspiration at the Second Hague Peace Conference, and in advocacy of the very principles for which the American Institute of International Law stands:

"The world [said Mr. Bourgeois] longs for peace.

"For centuries we have put our faith exclusively in the formula: '*Si vis pacem, para bellum*' [If you wish peace, prepare for war]; that is to say, we have confined ourselves to the *military organization of peace*. We have got beyond this, but we should not be satisfied in forming a mere humane organization, which I was about to call the *pacific organization of war*.

"The discussions which have taken place here in our midst have shown us the progress made in our views in this matter through education, and the new sentiment, each day more insistent, of the solidarity alike of nations and of mankind in the struggle against the fatality of nature. We have confidence in the increasing effect of these great moral forces, and we hope that the next Conference will force a still further development of

the humane principles which guided the Conference of 1899, by assuring in fact as well as in theory the *juridical organization of peace*."

THE POSITION OF THE FRIENDS

Bv ALLAN FARQUHAR

A Member of the Society of Friends

WHAT IS the proper position for Friends to take in the world crisis? We all know and feel that there is something to be done, that we would be recreant to our duty if we were to stand idly by, washing our hands of the whole wretched business, and sheltering ourselves behind the comforting thought that we are not responsible and that it is not our affair. We all believe that there is important work to do, though we may differ in the part that we should take.

Nineteen hundred years ago there came a new and divine message, "Love your enemies." Nothing of the kind had ever been taught before, and in the centuries since then it has fallen mostly on deaf ears. Even now it apparently has little consideration. Yet, the spirit of this message must be followed if wars are to be done away with forever. In any course of action we take we must keep ever before us as our guiding star: "What will do most, and do it soonest, to disarm our enemies by transforming them into our friends?" If our enlightened conscience, our careful and unprejudiced study of recent history, shows us clearly and unmistakably that they are in the wrong, it would be a poor manifestation of love for us not to use our best endeavors to check that harmful tendency.

"There is more joy in heaven over one sinner that repented than over ninety and nine that go not astray." This may be true, but nowhere is it declared that we should love our enemies *better* than our friends. It is not alone the Germans and their best interests (next after our own) that must be considered in any decision we make. The universal God who is Father of our brothers in Germany bears the same relation to those in England, France, and the other countries of the world. The war is an existing fact, not something that can be warded off by wise statesmanship, fervent prayers, or righteous conduct on our part. We are face to face with the fact that unless Germany is to win the conflict (which no lover of mankind can desire), any failure on our part to devote every ounce of our strength, every dollar we can spare, every talent we possess, on behalf of the Allies, will postpone the end of the war just that much, with all the horrors and suffering this will involve.

Christ preached non-resistance, and his life was sacrificed in that noble cause. But the situation now is not one of self-defense against a personal attack, so much as of the best way to bring an end as soon as possible to the most awful catastrophe perhaps that ever afflicted humanity, in order that the blessings of peace may once more descend upon us. Whether that peace is permanent or not it is for the future to say, but any respite will be welcome, and it will be more likely to last if the best elements of the American people give earnest support to the Government so long as it keeps on the high plane of the President's message of last April.

With the utmost charity and tolerance for all who differ, let each one of us in the words of Benjamin Hallowell "live up to the highest convictions of right and duty that are revealed to our watchful consciousness," and we need have no fear that the part taken by the Society of Friends will be a source of regret to those who come after us.

THE QUAKERS' ATTITUDE TOWARD WAR

By ALBERT G. THATCHER

(The following article, prepared at the request of several Friends, has been carefully read by them, and endorsed as expressing their views as well as those of the writer.)

I WRITE from the standpoint of a pacifist, but not of I a non-resistant. I can truthfully say, with many others, that this terrible war has taken much from the joy of living. I had believed that the world had passed beyond the possibility of another great war, especially of a war so full of horror as is this war.

The writer was old enough to take some part in the Civil War and his recollections of it are as vivid as though it were but yesterday. The Friends of 1861 were all, or nearly all, anti-slavery men and enthusiastic supporters of Abraham Lincoln. So when the Civil War broke out, it was but natural that they should support President Lincoln in all ways, even to the bearing of arms by many of their young men, to defend the Union and put down slavery. The late Henry W. Wilbur is reported to have said that our branch of the Society of Friends furnished more soldiers to the Union army in proportion to our total membership than any other denomination. At first thought this may seem an exaggeration, but in the Borough of Darby, where I lived at that time, out of eleven families of Friends having sons of military age, nine of them sent men to the army. This list includes some men like my own father, who served in the State militia when Lee crossed the Potomac in September, 1862.

These men had the anti-slavery cause so much at heart that it was a vital part of their religion. This being true, they rejoiced at each victory of the Union forces and were depressed and suffered with every Union defeat, even as that greatest of Quaker statesmen (since William Penn's day), that lover of freedom and righteousness, John Bright, testified that he likewise rejoiced and suffered. In fact, I believe that the right attitude for Friends of the present day to assume toward this present awful war has been shown to us by the attitude which John Bright then took toward our great struggle for freedom and righteousness, and I know of nothing that will so help us to clarify our vision and set ourselves aright in this emergency as a careful reading of the chapter entitled "The Civil War in America," in Trevelyan's great biography of this great English Friend and lover of peace. Throughout the course of that great struggle John Bright corresponded with Charles Sumner, who read his letters to President Lincoln, and he thus had much to do at critical times with the course of public affairs here, just as the suggestions of President Lincoln also had much to do, through John Bright, with the moulding of public sentiment in England. In one of his letters, quoted in this bio-

graphy, Bright uses the following language—this letter being addressed to an English friend:

"Mr. Sumner thinks that they are going too fast, and so do I. I want no end of the war, and no compromise, and no reunion, till the negro is made free beyond all chance of failure." And just after the surrender of Lee he wrote in his Journal as follows:

"Slavery has measured itself with freedom, and slavery has perished in the struggle. How often have I longed and prayed for this result, and how much have I suffered from anxiety whilst it has been slowly working out, I only know. This great triumph of the Republic is the event of our age. The friends of freedom everywhere should thank God and take courage; they may believe that the world is not forsaken by him who made it and who rules it."

Trevelyan may well say of this great Friend, as he does in this biography:

"Bright was a man of peace. *But he was not for peace at the price of slavery.*"

Is there no similarity now as to how Friends are placed in relation to this present war as compared to their attitude during the Civil War? In the Civil War two great principles were vindicated—the preservation of the National Union and the abolition of slavery. There are great principles to be vindicated in this present world-wide war; since the overthrow of the Russian Czar they appear clearer day by day. I need not repeat what our President has said with such force and eloquence. It seems to me that the German Kaiser is the exponent of the idea that "might makes right." Some years since this man, claiming the "Divine Right of Kings," in a speech to his soldiers starting out to suppress the Boxer Rebellion in China, said:

"When you meet the foe you will defeat him. No quarter will be given, no prisoners will be taken. Let all who fall into your hands be at your mercy. Just as the Huns, a thousand years ago under Attila, gained a reputation in virtue of which they still live in historical tradition, so may the name of Germany become known in such a manner in China that no Chinaman will ever again dare to look askance at a German."

I mention this to show the spirit of the Kaiser and the military party of Germany. To use an athletic term, they have been "running true to form" ever since. As Attila, called "the Scourge of God," is held up as a model, the word "Hun" comes to the military party of Germany quite legitimately. With this Fourth Century view, coupled with an equally medieval view of religion and woman's place in the world, held by the German Autocracy—I would say that Friends' views and the views of the Kaiser and his party are as far apart as the Poles. I therefore venture to think that our present-day Friends, when they read their morning papers, share the feelings of John Bright, as above referred to—they rejoice in each allied victory and feel depressed by each German temporary success. I am convinced that no body of people would suffer more in spirit and probably in person than our Friends, should the barbaric German idea of Kultur win the ultimate victory and subdue the world. Let us rather continue to hold to Lincoln's great faith, that "Right makes might;" and to share John Bright's hope, that "the friends of freedom everywhere shall again have cause to thank God